The Unitarian Christian

Vol. 13 SPRING, 1958 No. 4

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

JERUSALEM REVISITED Edwin C. Broome

SOME COMMENTS: Humanism Contributed

A CHANGE OF MIND AND HEART John H. Dietrich

ANNUAL MEETING

SUBSTITUTES FOR GOD Contributed

A PROBLEM IN SEMANTICS William Stanley Parker

ANSWER Carl Bihldorff

OUR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES
It Is Faith that Counts Dana McL. Greeley
Great Decisions Ernest Kuebler

THE RESOLUTIONS

WHAT WE EXPECT OF OUR PRESIDENT Editors

THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN

THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN is dedicated to the preservation of the Christian tradition from which the Unitarian Movement evolved. While recognizing the fact that there is truth in all the world's great religions, we are conscious of our desire and duty "to diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of the religion which Jesus taught as love to God, and love to man." While recognizing Unitarian zeal to seek new truth and "try all things," we would no less zealously "hold fast to that which is good," and which we recognize as the pure Christianity practised by the true followers of Jesus.

THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN is published four times a year in October, December, March and May, by the Unitarian Christian Fellowship. (*President*, Rev. Paul H. Chapman; *Vice Presidents*, Mr. Marshall I. Stone, Mrs. Herbert Lyman; *Cor. Secretary*, Mr. Ralph Lazzaro; *Rec. Secretary*, Rev. Charles C. Forman; *Treasurer*, Mr. Constant Wendell.)

Editorial Board: Rev. Charles E. Park, Chairman; Rev. Charles C. Forman, Rev. Carl Bihldorff, Rev. Alan G. Deale, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mr. Constant Wendell, Mr. Keith F. Warren.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: $1.00 a year payable to Treasurer, Constant Wendell, Unitarian Christian Publication Office, 102 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

Entered as second class matter at Boston Post Office, Oct. 25, 1954.

We believe you will find THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN both interesting and helpful. Its aim is to be:

- *Not dogmatic, but suggestive.*
- *Not controversial, but provocative of your own thought.*
- *Not blindly conservative, not defiantly radical, but always open-minded.*
- *An effort to seek the truth by preserving "all the good the past hath had," especially the words and personality of Jesus of Nazareth, and by reverently comparing notes with one another.*
- *In short, an intimate conversation in print.*

We extend a hearty welcome to all subscribers, old and new, large and small. However, in order that we may do full justice to the work in hand, we make an earnest appeal for the larger contributions.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. PARK, CONSTANT WENDELL

UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP 102 MT. VERNON ST. BOSTON 8, MASS.

Name .....

Address .....

Enclosed:

☐ $2.00 for membership and magazine

EDITORIAL

We shall get nowhere until we understand each other, especially understand what we mean and what the other fellow means by the term "Christian." One can think of six or eight variants of our religion all of which claim to be Christianity, but no two of which are in precise agreement.

There was that first company of Jews, the Ebionites (poor people) comprising the actual friends and acquaintances of Jesus, who cherished their personal memories of his words, his deeds, his personality and spirit, and told the story of his life to their neighbors and children, and won them over to their convictions. These were the first Christians, although it would be ten or fifteen years before the term Christian would be applied to them. They were still Jews in every particular save that they consented to his claim that he was the Nation's expected Messiah, and believed that he had risen from the dead and would speedily appear again in power and glory to establish God's Kingdom on earth. They must live out the interval in his way, loving God with all their might and other people, their neighbors, as themselves.

This first company was just a Jewish sect. It is sometimes called "Jewish Christianity." By his conversion Paul automatically became that kind of a Christian, but did not long remain so. He realized that if allowed to remain a mere Jewish sect Christianity would be extinct in two generations. His object therefore was to give it to the Gentiles, and the surest way to do so was to fashion it, in thought and manner of worship as nearly as possible after the pattern of the "Mystery Cults" which were so numerous and so popular among the common people of the day. This he did with such success that in less than a generation Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Thessaly, Greece, even Egypt and Italy fell under the spell of this new Christianity. Even the cult of Mithra, its strongest rival, had to surrender. In this form our religion is known as Pauline Christianity.

Paul was a good man, and he did a great service in that he rescued our Christianity from the extinction that would have been inevitable. We owe him our gratitude; at the same time we cannot forget that the service he did was done at the cost of a disservice, which was destined to grow to alarming proportions and become the source of a vast amount of needless misunderstanding. The service he did was to save Christianity, the very name of Jesus, the life he lived, from complete oblivion. The disservice he did was in giving the world the noxious habit of ignoring the teachings, but deifying the teacher. In presenting Jesus as a man whose own spirit had been driven out and replaced by the divine Spirit, thus enabling him to live a sinless life and offer himself as a vicarious atonement for the guilt of humanity, Paul had to forget at least two of the basic assumptions upon which Jesus built his religion: first, that his Heavenly Father no more demanded atonement for past sins than an earthly father would demand it. God was as forgiving, as patient, as understanding as the best earthly father. Read the parable of the Prodigal Son. And second: man did not need to have his spirit supplanted by a divine spirit; it was already potentially divine, God's gift of life and thought and reason, bestowed upon him at his birth. Christ is constantly striving to teach men self-respect as creatures of the breath of God. Be ye therefore perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect. You can do it if you try hard enough.

In forgetting these two points in the teaching of Jesus, Paul was doing a disastrous amount of forgetting; and the worst of it is that he taught the habit to future theologians. "If the teachings are too hard to obey, ignore them and deify the teacher instead."

Beginning with Paul we can see that rule at work in every step of the development of Christianity. The next step is Gnostic Christianity. We can discover in its teaching not a single trace of the teachings of Jesus; but we are offered a Jesus who has become the Logos, the Very Word of God, and the foremost of the emanations which the Gnostic Pleroma, the Fulness of the Godhead, was constantly throwing off for the enlightenment of the world.

So it is in the remaining steps. In the early struggles of Trinitarian Christianity, Jesus is the Only Begotten Son of the Father who shares with the Father the dignity of the Triune Godhead. Later, he is promoted to full identity with God; Very God of Very God; Homo-ousia; and with this step in his apotheosis the gap between his own teachings on the hills and lake-sides of Galilee, and the teachings of this new church of which he is made the sponsor, and to which he has given his name, is wider and deeper than ever.

Speaking of sponsors, when Edgar Bergen needs a new sponsor he chooses one who will lend prestige to his show, but will have nothing to say about the show itself. No matter who the sponsor is, it remains the same excellent show, with Charlie McCarthy and Mortimer Snerd. This looks like a well-fitting analogy. All through the first and second centuries Jesus was the most

desirable sponsor for any ambitious religion, because of his huge following; but he had not the slightest influence on the holy show that bore his name.

The point of all this is that if some of the ministers in our Fellowship find that their moral integrity requires them to repudiate the term "Christian," and have "no use for Christianity," and "out-grow their Christian heritage," it is their manifest duty to be more specific in their use of the term "Christianity." Like "Charity" it covers a multitude of theological aberations. Just what kind of Christianity have they in mind? Jewish, or Pauline, or Gnostic, or Trinitarian, or that fabric of dogmas that was assembled by the bishops and councils of the church in Rome shortly after it had assumed primacy over all the Christian churches, and which they set forth as the authoritative orthodox standard of Christian belief?

Mr. Stutzman, in his recent sermon: "Outgrowing our Heritage," sees the need of being specific, and tries to be so by citing Soren Kierkegaard as a sample of the Christianity that he feels he must out-grow. We heartily agree with him. To be sure, most of us never "in-grew" it, but we cheerfully take his word for it and approve. And when Mr. Stutzman goes on in still more specific fashion, and declares that he cannot quite follow Jesus in his recommendations that we "turn the other cheek," or think of God as "our Father in Heaven," or "believe in God; believe also in me; I am the way, the truth, and the life," we may make a reservation, but we still give our consent and approval. Jesus, the synoptic Gospels figure, never tells us what to believe: "Fear not, only believe." One of the striking differences between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel is that whereas the Synoptics always leave it to the individual to decide what specific thing he shall ask, or seek, or love, or fear not, or believe, the Fourth Gospel is downright dictatorial and dogmatic, and does the choosing for us, and tells us exactly what the predicate in each instance must be.

Incidentally, we wonder how a man of Mr. Stutzman's scholarship can in the same breath quote from Matthew and John, as though they were of equal authority. But that is a small matter. Would it not help if the anti-Christians among us would try as hard to understand us, Unitarian Christians, as we try to understand them? We are neither pedants nor bigots; our minds are as open as theirs, and our integrity as unquestionable. When we say "Christianity" we mean the thought, teaching, spirit, incentives, objectives, and spiritual values of Jesus the Man of Galilee, as portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels. When we are asked the moth-eaten question: "What is Unitarianism, anyway?" we are quite apt to reply: "An attempt to recapture and refashion the religion of the man Jesus of Nazareth; his profound love of God, his intense human interest and solicitude, his devotion and fidelity to the will of God, his courage and purity of motive, for in him we see humanity at its best. For us, he is too precious a companion and too ennobling an influence to be forgotten."

C. E. P.

JERUSALEM REVISITED

Edwin C. Broome

As my Air Jordan DC-3 came in for a landing at the Khalandia Airport in Jerusalem last March, 1957, I had something of a feeling of coming home. In fact, that city or, to be specific, its Arab sector, had been my home for nearly two years. Now, there were restrictions on travel in the country, and I was coming home alone. Superficially nothing much had changed in the three years I'd been away; true, the landing strip had been lengthened, but it still crossed the main Nablus Road, true, the airport buildings had been enlarged and improved, but this seemed to be all. The same policeman greeted me who had done so in 1952 but, this time, we met as friends, for I had often talked with him before. It wasn't until I passed my old home in Sheikh Jarrah, at the edge of the city, that I saw a difference. The difference was a high, solid stone wall. This wall ran from the foot of the hill where my home used to be, clear to the Old City walls at Damascus Gate. I did not need to ask why it was there.

Actually, there had been very little wall building of this kind in Jerusalem since the days of Salah ed-Din (Saladin) in the 12th century. This new wall was modern. There were no ancient Herodian blocks re-used to save material, but the wall was thick and solid, just the same. It was meant to stop bullets instead of battering rams.

Our understanding of why the wall is there was a little like our understanding of the problems of Palestine generally. The river of trouble and controversy continues to flow with increasing volume and, like all rivers, it has many tributaries and sources. While most of us have a

fairly substantial knowledge of the historical Palestine—especially the Biblical part of it—our practical knowledge is a bit sketchy, and the propaganda which we often mistake for knowledge is powerful and convincing. Mix ignorance with the catalyst of propaganda, whatever its source, and we are bound to come up with a distorted picture. Vague and fuzzy shapes appear on the film, but what they represent, and what they mean, is often obscure. The result is an out-of-focus picture of the problems which exist in that unhappy land, a picture which is often superimposed on little other than an emotionalized background drawn from our very real and very sincere sympathies.

As I looked at this new wall, its shadow long in the afternoon sun, I wondered how many people felt as I did. I remembered the previous Christmas, when I was interviewed about establishing a credit rating at a New York department store. My interviewer had been with her husband in Jerusalem the same time I was there—for the same two years. "It is disheartening," she remarked, "how few people will believe what we tell them about the situation over there. Here, it's all one-sided." I knew what she had meant, of course —ignorance buttressed by sympathy is formidable like fighting City Hall. There is an increasing number of ex-government and ex-U.N. employees, business people, and students, who feel this way. This had been my own experience, also. When I first went to Palestine in 1952, I was sorry I was going to the Arab side. My experiences and relationships prior to that time had slanted me the other way and my sympathies were with the "heroic" new venture. I shared with most a deep sense of guilt for the anti-semitic beast which had recently raised its head again in Europe. I had taught Hebrew at Harvard, and studied in Zionist schools; I, too, thought I knew. I shared with most a contentedly ignorant picture of the Arab, and an impatience with his lack of sympathy for the aspirations of an historic people. My two years in the country, however, had showed be there was another side, a side I had not heard before.

First of all, of course, there were the moral considerations and the eye-witness stories of the terroisms and brutalities against the native Arab population which had been going on long before the outbreak of hostilities in 1948. These I'd heard very little about and, even allowing a normal 50% margin of error for exaggeration, they amounted to a sizeable factor in the picture.[1]

The Arabs had, of course, lived in the country for centuries; it was their home and their homeland. Some 6.1% of the land had been bought up by Jewish interests prior to 1948, the rest belonged, and still belongs to the Arabs, and for it there has been no compensation. Well over a million of these people had to refugee eastward, and are now, for the most part, still housed under conditions of intolerable squalor. Other thousands had been cut off from their lands by the armistice lines, and were consequently deprived of any means of livelihood, their citrus and olive groves or their fields being worked by the newcomers as though they were their own. The moral question presented itself crystal clear: was it right for a people, no matter how brutally persecuted, to turn against a weaker people, who had never done them any harm? Can we ethically "write off" over a million Arabs in order to make room for a million or more other refugees from Europe and elsewhere. This makes no sense, whether examined from a practical or a moral standpoint.

During World War II, on June 11, 1942, to be specific, Nazi soldiers entered the Czechoslovakian village of Lidice, massacred the male inhabitants, and turned the buildings to rubble. The world was appropriately shocked at this further illustration of Nazi brutality. The disturbance in America over Deir Yassin, Quibiyeh and later Nahalin, where much the same thing was done, and with no greater justification, was a ripple by comparison. We hesitate to draw the conclusion that brutality of this nature is justified if carried out by our friends and to be deplored and denounced only when done by our enemies. This shifting moral basis seems strange in our times, yet here it is, clear for those who wish to see it.[2]

Or, the broken promises made to the Arabs. The Churchill White Paper of 1922 is seldom quoted; it spoke of "further development of existing Jewish community in Palestine" . . . and assured the Arabs that a Jewish National home did not mean a "Jewish government to dominate the Arabs. We cannot tolerate the expropriation of one set of people by another," while the Mandatory Instrument included further clauses safeguarding Arab and non-Zionist rights. It was with this understanding that Sherif Hussein of Mecca signed an agreement with Weizmann and accepted the Balfour Declaration under specific guarantees of Arab independence. Actually, there is a substantial documentation covering the period from the Balfour Declaration in 1917,[3] and the outbreak of the Palestine War. A careful perusal of it will tell its own and rather shocking story.[4]

We have already alluded to Quibiyeh and other armed reprisals of an official nature on the part of Israel. What is the story of "armed Arab in-

filtrations" and border violations from the other side? At the outset, it should be pointed out that there is no international border between Israel and Jordan; it is an armistice line, and was never supposed to be anything else. That Israel considers it her national boundary is quite without any real justification. Technically, then, we cannot consider them border violations at all. Confining our remarks to Jordan alone, it is safe to say that there has not been a single border violation of an official nature to date. It is true that there have been numerous instances of individual "border" crossings by groups of Arabs, but by far the majority of these have been more or less personal affairs. Remember, the Armistice Line cut some villages in half, others were separated from their lands. Border violations in which a few peasants cross over to retake some of their goats, pick their own oranges or olives are in a very different category than Nahalin. There have been some more serious incidents, this is true, but nothing officially ordered, and there is a vast difference between the two types of "incident."

Typical is the following news broadcast from Qol Yisrael: "Armed Arab infiltrators crossed the border (sic) at X last night. They were traced back to the Transjordan (sic) border by bloodhounds. They stole two cows." The "border" violations merit careful scrutiny by him who would take sides in this affair. One of the troubles is, few of us have troubled to check the statistics on these border affairs, which are considered so provocative to a touchy Israel. Regarding the Jordan-Israeli armistice line, by 1953, there had been 16 resolutions condemning Israel for the use of her military forces against three condemnations of Jordan,[5] by the Mixed Armistice Commission. Furthermore, while the Security Council of the U.N. has to date never condemned any Arab nation for military attacks against Israel, Israel stands condemned four times for such attacks against her neighbors.[6]

What about Israeli border violations other than the famous ones? There have been many. I'll report on two. The Hadassah Hospital and the former Hebrew University on Mt. Scopus is under U.N. control, and an Israeli garrison is stationed there for "housekeeping" purposes. It is a good mile and a half inside Jordan, and Israeli troops are convoyed over under protection of the Arab Legion at specified intervals. One morning there was no water in Arab Jerusalem. The pipe line from Ain Farah had been blown up during the night, and the perpetrators traced to the edge of this U.N. enclave. Israeli soldiers refused to admit the U.N. representatives and, of course, the matter had to drop at that point. Who had done it was obvious. Another incident, since it involved the death of a friend of mine, is worth describing in a little more detail. An Arab policeman had noticed some Israeli soldiers entering the 100-yard-wide strip of "No Man's Land" which bisects Jerusalem, and hid in a cave. They had no business there, for the territory was "off limits" to both sides. He took a step or two forward to see more clearly, when a shot rang out, and he fell. The shot had come either from the cave or from Israel itself. In a moment the Sten guns opened up, and we could hear the ricochet of the bullets. Since I was on my way home and in the line of fire, I dived for the nearest culvert. In the next few days, some 23 people were shot down, in the Old City of Jerusalem; all were civilians. The Arabs exercised amazing restraint during the entire period, and not a shot was fired back. Israeli Jerusalem, opposite the Old City, is on higher ground, and shooting over the walls of the Old City into the Arab quarter is easy.

The argument is sometimes used to the effect that the Arabs had the land for centuries, and did nothing with it, therefore another, more aggressive people had the right to take over. We seem to have forgotten that this is precisely the argument used by the Nazis to justify the invasion of Poland in 1939. Again, it would seem as though the moral issue is clouded by considerations of friendship. What is more, who is to say that given the same millions of dollars from sympathetic supporters outside the country, the Arab might not have achieved a similar technological progress?

Now, one last point about the refugees. Did they leave "voluntarily" as some would insist? Probably just as voluntarily as those volunteers went to help the Communist in North Korea. If you are living where bombs are falling, it is reasonable to leave. If you are driven out, you generally leave, if you fear that military action will soon be taking place in your dooryard, you leave. Such considerations created the refugees. To deny these people the right to return is about as reasonable as it would have been to deny Londoners the right to return home after the Blitz on the ground that they had left of their own free will, and "abandoned" their property. Finally, we have too quickly forgotten the U.N. resolutions, and the Armistice Agreement.

A pertinent Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly reads:

> ". . . that the (Palestine) refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those

choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property."

And today, after nine years of Armistice, the refugees still reside in their camps, the resolution patently ignored. No amount of "absentee owner" laws passed by Israel can justify what is nothing else than downright appropriation of property to which there is no legal right whatsoever.

There was a great deal to think about those days last spring in Jerusalem as I looked at that wall. There is much more that could be told, but it is best to turn to the documents, of the U. N. and the period before 1948, recognizing that without the actual facts, any stand is emotionally determined and, in our time, we need the facts even more Long ago, Aristotle stated that a horse had a certain number of teeth. It was many centuries before anybody opened a horse's mouth and checked up on Aristotle. It might be wise for us all to do some checking in the documentation and count, once more, the teeth of the horse! It is not anti-semantic to insist on the facts and also to insist that those whom we consider our friends to follow the ways of morality as well.

[1]A factual account of some of these may be found in Lilienthal's book "What Price Israel," and a documented account with photographs in "The Rising Tide of Terror" published as a pamphlet by the Jordan Government.

[2]For documentation on these and other attacks, see The Record of Israel at the United Nations (Arab Information Center), 1957, pp 85ff.
For later illustrations, particularly at Gaza, see National Herald, April, 1957, p. 4f.

[3]On the Balfour Declaration itself, see Lilienthal, L. C. pp 22ff.

[4]For a fairly thorough story of this period see "Destin de la Palestine," Etude redigee par le Bureau Arabe a Londres (August, 1947).

[5]For the actual documentation on this point, see U. N. document S/PV 635, p. 41-2

[6]To wit, on May 18, 1951 (S/2175), November 24, 1953 (S/3139 Rev. 2), March 29, 1955 (S/3378) and January 19, 1956 (S/3538). These were all armed attacks, launched by regular Israeli armed forces.

Some Comments on Kenneth Warren's "What About Humanism?"

Although, taken as a whole, I found many things to agree with in Ken Warren's article in your Christmas, 1957, issue "What About Humanism?" there were a number of questions and criticisms that came to mind.

First off, I'm glad that Ken recognizes that "in general, humanism is an emphasis on humanity." This is simply and excellently said—but looking farther along I found no answer to my immediate question—well, what then is Christianity, or Unitarianism? Emphasis on something else? Certainly not emphasis on God to the exclusion of emphasis on man. And, perhaps it goes without saying that emphasis on God without emphasis on man leads to mere theological obscurantism.

This question of emphasis on what does need some further exploration. In my own non-humanist, non-theist, non-willingness-to-be-pigeonholed way I've been reading some things lately that shed a pinpoint of light on this subject. In a discussion of medieval monasticism and of St. Francis of Assisi I came across one author's opinion that St. Francis' greatest contribution to his age and to all civilization was that capacity of caring so intensely for one's fellow men that all questions of doctrine and dogma sink into relative unimportance. Is this sense of concern for, and appreciation of the deep pathos of *human* life something devisive? Or is this deep feeling of caring an emotion that can unite liberals in religion whatever they permit themselves to be called?

In another place Ken reminds us that humanism "in one form or another has existed for centuries." Perhaps, but I think a fundamental spirit I'd like to call religious has existed for a longer time—and I think that that spirit transcends humanism, theism and atheism as well as God and our ideas about God. It is time we asked ourselves whether or not we as a denomination, seeking further adventures of the religious spirit, can let our quite human propensities for using little labels stand in the way of our possibly larger contribution to this adventure were we not so concerned. Are we not willing to learn anything of the lessons of the logician and semanticist about the dangers inherent in quarreling over words? Isn't it a waste of energy to let ourselves be worried over words when we can unite our efforts to meet the needs of a human brotherhood which we all recognize?

I thought that some time back I had read an excellent little pamphlet stating why the humanist-theist controversy is (was) out of date. I don't remember the reason given right at this moment. But perhaps I can supply some of my own. First of all I think we are, all of us, reasonable enough to recognize that science is not yet ready to let us prove the existence of a supreme being by adducing facts from its body of knowledge. The notion of something "supreme" may be vaguely acceptable to many of us. But "being" as we small humans know being is hardly a conceivable concept given what we know now of the universe at its smallest and its largest.

Secondly, I cannot understand for the life of me how those who let themselves be called theists can tell that God's odor of sanctity is profaned by the nearness of the humanist reek! Must struggling man presume to defend God? Certainly we are all important as we see ourselves individually, and therefore our little ideas of supreme deity are important to us also. But can't we be satisfied to keep these ideas close to our hearts, nurturing them, and letting that conception which is supreme to us shine forth?

As I see it, there is only one way we *know* anything about deity—and that is through a person's life. What they do with their life, how they relate what they do and feel related at the same time to some personal yet eternal sensativity to the universe is what counts. I know we all like to think we can classify attitudes towards the universe, but it is we who do the classifying, not the universe which is classified. Let's not forget this.

Reading through his article Ken Warren has some excellent things to say. He reminds us of our responsibility to worship, and to always try to catch in our worship something that can be expressed in no other way than as worship of an infinite, transcendent God who is yet within and among mankind. This is something humanists and theists must mark and inwardly digest, but for different reasons. Humanists must not forget that a mark of worship is aspiration as well as inspiration. Ministers often think they inspire, but the mark of their accomplishment is the aspiration of individual members of their congregations. Somehow I think aspiration is something like the intense conversions the fundamentalists believe possible—only, while I think there is intensity to it, there is also the feeling of continuing process, on-going activity about it. And theists must not forget that the use of a traditionalist terminology, a gody verbiage is not in itself enough. I happen personally to feel uncomfortable with this gody terminology, but those who do not as well as those who do have the responsibility of making their thoughts live, of ever giving vigorous meaning to whatever they say, however they say it. The aspiration of others, the commitment of others is not produced by merely using the right set of words. We seek manifold transformations of the human spirit towards a greater good, not conformity in our speech.

American religion today lacks the socially conscious prophetic voice which relates itself to a just, majestic, all-pervasive God-concept. But whether we seek to relate ourselves to "God" or to some sense of the infinity behind, ahead and around us do the actual, literal words mean so much. In worrying so about the words themselves aren't we losing sight of the poetic, mystical element in religion? And, again, I wonder if we must not ask ourselves whether or not the sometimes unpopular people who are agnostic about God in their public expressions are not felt by some Unitarians as threatening to our respectability and stumbling blocks to our growth. Can we, after all, ignore the history and the sociology of religion and say for sure that somewhere in this humanist-theist-agnostic discussion there isn't some desire of the "conservatives" to conform to the officially God-fearing spirit of America today? Shouldn't we be learning from history and sociology just how hard it is to organize unity in diversity; how hard it is to stop up the dike through which flows the water that will freeze us into a monolithic institutional structure?

Instead of concern over just what place these "humanists" shall occupy in our household of faith, ought we not be asking ourselves whether we are willing—as we grow in numbers and become an ever more respectable denomination—to preserve the fundamental tradition of diversity among ourselves? All history is strewn with the dead fragments of vital, dynamic, creative institutions like our own, who, becoming accepted amongst the powerful classes, then snuffed out the light of creativity, diversity and adventure.

Finally I must ask, with all the force I can muster, just who are the guardians of this liberal, Unitarian faith "which has meant so much to our forefathers and us . . ."—who are the guardians who would keep our theism and our humanism apart, forbidding in their guardianship a change of outlook? Who dares to say that what *was before,* will *be* in the future? *Who are we* to welcome humanists "as respected and valued members in good standing"? The desire in us all to build castles out of words, neat systems to contain nifty thoughts may lead us to presume we have a right to welcome a person as an outsider. But such is not the pathway along which deep fellowship is built. Rather let's be great, let's be magnanimous in our use of words, and let's grow beyond the need for little word pictures in our heads which tell us where everything fits. Let's be so great in our denominational thinking that we shall truly catch the inner meaning of Emerson's phrase: "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds."

The Unitarian Christian Fellowship meets for supper at Old South Parish House, Copley Square, at 5.30, Sunday, May 25. Speaker: Dr. Sidney E. Mead, President of Meadville: "Educating the Liberal Minister." Tickets $1.50, at 25 Beacon Street, Reservation Desk.

A CHANGE OF MIND AND HEART

In view of the long-drawn controversy over Humanism which is still raging among us, the following letter has a lively, and to some of us a painful significance. Most of us will recognize Mr. Dietrich, the author, as one of the first and most vociferous of our "Humanists." He was at one time minister of The First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, a pastorate which he held for twenty-two years.

May 15, 1956

Mr. Joseph S. Loughran
4831 E. 22nd Street
Tucson, Arizona

Dear Mr. Loughran:

My activities are very restricted because of illness, so that I am not able at this time to give you an adequate reply to your questions in your letter of yesterday, but I do want you to know that the pamphlet on "Humanism" to which you refer does not any longer express my philosophy, in fact I no longer call myself a Humanist. Perhaps I can give you some idea of my position in a few words.

The fact is that my philosophy and religion have undergone considerable, if not drastic revision. I realize now how my utter reliance upon science and reason and my contempt for any intuitive insights and intangible values which are the very essence of art and religion, was a great mistake; and the way in which I cut mankind off from all cosmic relationship, denying or ignoring every influence outside of humanity itself was very short-sighted and arrogant. I have come now to believe that we cannot ignore "the power behind phenomena," or God, if you please. I still hesitate to use the latter term because of the crude connotation which it suggests to most people; but much reading and mature reflection have convinced me of the reality of a spiritual power in the universe. I would hesitate to define it or even explain its workings, but I believe that by meditation we can experience its pressence, bring ourselves into harmony with it, and find our lives enriched and energized. The world today needs above all else the ethical fibre and spiritual integrity, which science cannot and does not pretend to furnish, but which religion can furnish, I mean real religion, not orthodox theology or organized ecclesiasticism.

I mean the kind of religion which arises from the consciousness of being a product and part of an all-powerful and all-penetrating force—God, nature, creative force—call it what you will, which is the dynamic of the whole universe, and which amid all the ups and downs of evolution and human history seems to drive toward improvement in every form, although frustrated by human ignorance and arrogance. Religion should seek to make people conscious of the fact that in every moment of their existence their lives are nourished, animated and urged toward better things by the inescapable presence of this all-enveloping power. We should seek to develop this contact, making it more intimate and thus more effective, for it is this intimate contact which flowers into what we call the spiritual life, and in which the world today is so sadly lacking.

I probably have not said enough to make my position clear, but I want you to know that my philosophy has undergone a change. I think Humanism had value as a protest movement with an emphasis upon human betterment, but its day has passed, and should be replaced by a more mature attitude toward the universe and human existence.

Sincerely yours,
(signed) JOHN H. DIETRICH

ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Unitarian Christian Fellowship was held on Monday evening, April 7, 1958, at the Arlington Street Church, Boston, Massachusetts. Owing to a severe storm of rain and wind the attendance was hardly up to expectations; but those who were brave enough to make the venture were amply rewarded.

Following the supper, a business meeting was held for the election of officers for the ensuing year, and for the discharge of any other business, including the question of incorporation.

The Nominating Committee presented their report, and the following officers were elected unanimously:

Honorary President, Mr. Robert H. Loomis
President, Rev. Paul H. Chapman
First Vice-President, Mr. Marshall I. Stone
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Herbert Lyman
Corresponding Secretary, Mr. Ralph Lazzaro
Recording Secretary, Rev. Charles C. Forman
Treasurer, Mr. Constant Wendell
Directors for three years,
Prof. James L. Adams Prof. Kenneth O. Myrick
Director for two years, Mr. Thomas F. Peterson

After the business meeting our guest speaker, Mrs. Elizabeth D. Whitney spoke on "Understanding Alcoholics: and What can we Do about It?"

SUBSTITUTES FOR GOD

Some of the noblest words Shakespeare ever wrote are found in "King Henry VIII," the last page of Act 3. Woolsey is addressing Cromwell, not Oliver but Thomas: "Cromwell, I charge you, fling away ambition. Love thyself last. Nourish those hearts that hate thee. Still, in thy right hand carry gentle peace to silence envious tongues. Be just, and fear not. Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's, thy God's, and truth's. O Cromwell, Cromwell, had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my king, he would not in mine age have left me naked to mine enemies."

Woolsey was not the first man, nor the last, who has lived this earthly life with such whole-souled absorption and enthusiasm that he has felt no need of God, and has had no time to waste on religion. Very often the world is to human hearts just what it was to Woolsey: a completely adequate substitute for God, and for any of the gifts and blessings which the thought of God can bring.

The elemental needs of the human spirit are not extravagant, and not many: a feeling of security, the sense of being a valued and respected member of Society, a task that is congenial and wholly within the powers Nature has bestowed, success enough to justify self-respect, a pinch of self-indulgence and a dash of luxury, a modicum of love and being loved, a clean heart and a quiet mind. Seven out of ten persons will ask no more than the gratification of these reasonable desires; and three out of the seven will find that the world can amply supply this gratification. There may be a God; but they don't need him so why trouble him? This little planet is an adequate substitute. There may be such things as the blessings of religion, but they are superfluous. The world furnishes a supply of blessings so generous that men can be born, go to school, grow up, build a home, rear a family, make a little money, fade away, and be gathered to their fathers, and never once exhaust that supply of earthly blessings with which this good little planet equips them.

But Woolsey also found that however adequate these substitutes may be in their immediate and tangible reality, it is always wise to keep in some secret corner of the mind the thought of God behind his substitutes, the Eternal Reality back of these comforting supporting phantasms of earth. Substitutes have a way of failing us just when most needed. Phantasms are but shadows, and when clouds of tragedy and failure obscure the sun they vanish. One of the most reassuring sights on our New England landscape is the typical old solidly built family homestead that has sheltered generations in the past, and is mutely eloquent of family weddings, christenings, Thanksgivings, and Christmas reunions. But read Robert Frost's little poem, "Bereft."

Out in the porch's sagging floor,
Leaves got up in a coil and hissed,
Blindly struck at my knee and missed.
Something sinister in the tone
Told me my secret must be known:
Word I was in the house alone
Somehow must have gotten abroad,
Word I was in my life alone,
Word I had no one left but God.

Christianity: A Problem in Semantics

by William Stanley Parker

I read recently a sermon by a minister who wanted to make it clear why he did not want to call himself a Christian. It seemed to me a strange and rather sad struggle with semantics, in which the result was not a clarification, but a confusion, of what he believed. I have read another sermon in which again the problem of semantics is dominant, seeking a clear definition of the meaning of Charity. He points out what charity meant when St. Paul used it in his first letter to the Corinthians. That seems to me to be the approach that should be used in considering whether or not one wishes to consider himself, and to be considered by others one of those persons that can be properly designated as Christians.

In seeking to prove to himself that he is not properly a Christian the writer of the sermon quotes certain of the statements of Jesus, as reported in the New Testament, that he says he cannot accept, as they conflict with other things Jesus said. Without regard to the precise statements, that fact could properly prove he could not be designated as a Fundamentalist, because clearly he does not accept literally every word of the Bible. But it hardly is an adequate reason for saying he is not a Christian—that is, as the word was first understood before a group of men several hundred years later gave it a dogmatic interpretation.

The term "Christianity" represents a religious concept based upon the teachings of Christ. It could equally well be based on the teachings of Jesus. Thus the semantic problem is disclosed. A man who follows the precepts of Luther can call himself a Lutheran; or if of Calvin then a Calvinist. St. Paul gives his name to the Paulist Fathers. How should one indicate his desire to follow the precepts of Christ Jesus? Jesus is his name; Christ is his title. A very little thought

is needed to see the difficulty with which the name Jesus can be turned into an adjective, and the ease with which the title Christ can be so used. That is the whole reason why the words Christian and Christianity came into common usage.

Why worry over some words in the King James version? They had been written in another, perhaps several other, languages, perhaps hundreds of years after the sayings were originally made, and by a man who was constantly talking in parables. If one finds difficulty in understanding what they were originally intended to mean why worry about it? Accept the fact humbly, and hope that some day the inner truth may be understood. Why discard, on that small account, the fundamental significance of Christ as Christianity, which properly embraces all those who believe in the basic philosophy of Jesus?

It is always amazing to me that those who prefer to call themselves Humanists should seek in this and other ways to dissociate themselves from the finest example of humanity that ever lived.

AN ANSWER

Carl Bihldorff

The minister who, from the pulpit of the Unitarian church in Washington, D. C., said that he cannot accept the teachings of Jesus nor try to emulate his life, made good copy for the press; but I wonder whether he really helped the cause of the church he serves or enabled those who heard him to think more clearly on the subject.

The life and teachings of Jesus and the purpose and future of Christianity are tremendous themes, and to deal with both in a single sermon and dispose of them so neatly suggests either the mark of genius or its opposite.

Mr. Ralph W. Stutzman entitled his newsworthy sermon "Outgrowing Our Heritage," and he said that if Unitarians were honest they would have to admit that they are now out of Christianity. It seems to me that we were wise if first we grew up to our spiritual heritage. Have we outgrown the Sermon on the Mount? Are the two Great Commandments of no relevance to our time? Are the spiritual simplicities of Jesus' thought: faith, hope, compassion, love, forgiveness and human service outmoded concepts? Mr. Stutzman declares that Unitarianism is dedicated to the discipleship of advancing truth. But what are the religious truths Unitarianism can lay claim to having discovered which transcend the fundamental teachings of Jesus? Mr. Stutzman doesn't name one!

I don't mean to be too hard on this former orthodox Christian. He is going through the same growing pains many have borne. The picture which the Gospels paint of Jesus is inadequate. Mr. Stutzman himself states that they are not satisfactory biographies. Of course they aren't. But then Mr. Stutzman quotes them to prove what he has already said they can't prove.

Time will undoubtedly improve Mr. Stutzman's logic, and when he has spent his antagonism toward a neo-orthodoxy out of which he came, he will—I trust—discover that Unitarianism at its finest has always found in Jesus a beacon light of inspiration and guidance, strength and challenge. It is hard to catch up with Jesus, to say nothing of overpassing him!

Introducing Our Presidential Candidates

The editors of THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN, while editorially uncommitted, are pleased to present to our readers the two nominees for the office of President of the Unitarian Association. Dr. Greeley and Dr. Kuebler have consented to make a personal statement of their attitudes and feelings about the office to be filled by election at the annual meeting of the Association in May.

Dana McLean Greeley was graduated from Harvard College in 1931 and from Harvard Divinity School in 1933. He holds the degree of Doctor of Divinity from Meadville Theological Seminary. Dr. Greeley was ordained in 1932. He served our churches in Lincoln, Mass., and Concord, New Hampshire, before accepting a call to the Arlington Street Church where he has had for the past twenty-three years a distinguished ministry. Well-acquainted with the organization and administration of the American Unitarian Association, he served as secretary of the Association for 8 years until 1953. Since then he has been President of the Unitarian Service Committee.

Ernest W. Kuebler holds the degrees of Bachelor of Philosophy from Kansas City Junior College, Bachelor of Religion, and Master of Arts from Boston University. He was honored by the Starr King School for the Ministry with a degree of Doctor of Theology. Ernest W. Kuebler came to the American Unitarian Association in 1935 after serving as Director of Religious Education in the Congregational Church in Newton, Mass. He then became Director of the Department of Religious Education of the AUA and with the creation of the Council of Liberal Churches he became the Director of Department of Education for that group in 1954. He was Executive Vice President of the AUA for a period of five years.

MR. GREELEY

It Is the Faith that Counts

Ralph Waldo Emerson was accustomed to speaking of the primacy and the grandeur of the soul, and he habitually asserted that "nothing can be greater than it." Following his lead, we need to realize that it is our religion, our faith, that is of primary importance, and not the institutions that are the expressions or instruments of that religion. Churches can endure, and have endured, with very little spiritual comprehension or moral purpose within them; and they don't necessarily create spirituality. But religion never did exist in the hearts of men, or as an element within a culture, without finding or producing media for its mission. What I am saying—and I think it has been said by the greatest leaders in our movement from 1819 or 1825 to the present moment—is that the ideas that we harbor and the principles that we cherish are more fundamental and far-reaching in their effect than any ecclesiastical machinery. I would rather that we would lose 25 Beacon Street and all our meeting-houses, and that our Association with a capital A should vanish into oblivion, than that we should lose our vision, and our dedication to God and man, and to freedom and the truth. To say it in another way, our convictions and our morale should constitute for us a far greater concern than our millions of dollars in endowment, or the manner of electing our Board of Directors, even though we could use more endowment and make our elections more democratic.

Unitarians have a very rich heritage in this country, and around the world, and have contributed way out of proportion to their numbers, to the development of statesmanship and education and philanthropy, and to the advancement of civilization. But the reason that they have done what they have done is that their religion has been personal, and at least to some extent they have benefited from the admonition of Jesus, "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." They have known an inner light, and have felt an ethical passion, that have guided them and consecrated them in the service of the highest. And the hope for Unitarianism in the years ahead, if it would fulfill its great destiny, is that we shall have the reverence in our hearts, and the hunger for knowledge, and the poetry in our souls, that our fathers possessed.

If this little article is intended to be personal, I should say that the chief reason that I have consented to be a candidate for the presidency of the American Unitarian Association is because I believe in the validity and the promise of liberal religion and, although I have loved my own pulpit and people with a very deep devotion, I shall be eager, if the responsibility is given to me, to do what little I can to re-kindle the flame of our faith, or quicken our confidence in our cause, across the land. Our religion is not of the past; it is for the future.

I do enjoy organizational and administrative work, however; and I find satisfaction in trying to vindicate in practice our democratic ideals. I would like to see us achieve a larger measure of mutual respect and common endeavor among all our churches in the United States and Canada. We should be increasing the numbers of our churches and our fellowships more rapidly than we are, and we should be exerting ourselves more wisely and more strenuously to make the impact of our religion felt in modern society. At the same time that we are preaching the gospel of love, we should be practising the brotherhood of

man. And we should have departments of our Association designed to help build the kingdom of God as well as to erect new churches. And for all our efforts, if our religion means as much to us as it can to mankind, we should have more generous support. For true Unitarians religion is not an elective, or an option, in the university of life; it is a required course. It is a priority and a necessity, and they treat it as such.

The issues before us at the present time with relation to the presidential contest are not easy for me to outline. But they may have some connection with what I have said already. They also include whether we regard the whole of our denomination as greater than any of its parts, and whether we wish to enhance the strength of our continental movement instead of letting it be dissipated by the regions. One candidate is nominated with the thought that perhaps the president has been too strong, or too heavily burdened, in the past, and that the office might advantageously be divided. I believe that strong leadership, as well as democratic leadership, is as good for a Fellowship of Churches as it is for a single church, and that the presidency need not be dwarfted or divided, but that many of its duties can be delegated. People have talked about appraisal and reorganization; I am for both of these, but I want self-dedication as well as self-analysis, and I am convinced that we need not wait for reorganization, but can move forward, and improve our organization simultaneously.

I do not ask for election. I am profoundly happy in the work that I have been doing. But if the people want me, or it is my obligation to serve in this capacity, I shall give to the office the best that I have, asking sympathy from my friends, and candor from my enemies, if such there be. For me, every Unitarian is a friend; and fellowship, without restrictions, is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell. I have no commitments to any persons or any groups, and shall have none. Some people will be shocked at times by my liberalism, or even radicalism, and others will be disturbed by my conservatism. I shall make mistakes. I pray that I shall have the courage to admit them and the wisdom to correct them, and that all of us together, more and more forgetting those things which are behind, and striving for those things which are before, may "press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God."

MR. KUEBLER

Great Decisions

In this middle decade of the twentieth century Unitarians may well be facing one of the most important periods of our history. In the 1930s, the re-thinking of the basic purposes of our movement accompanied by organizational and structural changes laid a good foundation on which was built a growth which has become almost phenomenal and certainly explosive. The unprecedented numerical growth, of individual members and churches and fellowships, has buoyantly lifted our spirits and hopes, but the period has also been accompanied by strains on the organizational structure, the relationships of affiliated groups, and the development of a central organization with adequate provisions for regionalism.

Those on our national and regional committees, as well as officers, staff and Board members are well aware that within the last two or three years our total movement has again sensed the need for re-study of the direction in which we are going, our abilities to steer a straight course, and to decide which leadership will enable us to take advantage of the glorious opportunities

ahead. A partial list of the commissions and committees now doing this probing, attitude testing and scientific sampling of Unitarian opinion includes:

- The Commission on Planning and Review
- The Denominational Planning Council
- The Committee of the Board to Study the Organization of the A.U.A.
- A Committee authorized by the Board to evaluate Unitarian ability to raise a substantial Development Fund
- The Joint Senexet Conference for study of the standards of the Unitarian and Universalist Ministry
- The Joint Universalist-Unitarian Commission to study merger and to present one or more plans for consideration by both bodies.

There are also before our churches, at the present time, resolutions which may come before the 1958 Annual Meeting on such subjects as: (a) the clarification of the Unitarian position; (b) the establishment of a new Commission on Appraisal; (c) change in location and number of meetings of the Association. Self-appraisals are being carried on by the General Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women and there is a serious self-inquiry as to the function of the Liberal Religious Youth.

The Commission to Study Merger as reported by its Chairman to the A.U.A. Board in February, and in its letter addressed to churches, announced that shortly study materials will be released on merger and that a time schedule for study and decision-making has been prepared. Obviously, within the next few years, each local church and fellowship will be called upon for clear thinking and taking of votes on this important subject.

In the light of such developments within Unitarianism, it is obvious that Unitarians overwhelmingly desire to look carefully at their denominational affairs and organization. It is my understanding that in such a contest the Board of the Association made its recent selection of a nominee. It is my clear understanding that the Board at no time had the intention of our "marking time" during the years ahead; rather it voiced confidence in and made specific provisions for continued development of our total movement. The progress we have had has not alone been the result of the Board nor any one man. It has resulted from the combined effort and devotion as well as the faith of the thousands who call themselves Unitarians today and will in increasing numbers join us in the future.

In accepting the nomination of the Board of Directors, I clearly indicated that the President of our movement must give strong and positive leadership in the years ahead. Far-reaching plans to accelerate the growth and development of Unitarianism in the United States and Canada as well as in other countries were presented to the Board by Dr. Eliot at a recent meeting. I had a small part in shaping these plans and obviously will do everything in my power to bring them into being. Among the proposals under consideration by your Board are an extensive recruitment program for the Unitarian ministry with added professional personnel in this area; providing the staff and materials necessary to give direct guidance and assistance to our burgeoning Fellowship movement; the establishment of an internal Public Relations Department making possible more effective communications between our several national and regional offices as well as establishing direct paths of understanding between individual Unitarians and the movement as a whole; the follow-up of the Chicago Congress of the I.A.R.F. with expanded program in the World Churches Department; the several experiments in student and college campus developments should indicate the direction in which a full-time professional staff member might be able to unite the rich resources within our fellowship and focus them upon the opportunities before us. Such expansion and development will take place only as the result of an increasingly effective United Unitarian Appeal with larger sums being made available to the A.U.A.

The record is clear. I did not seek this nomination. The Board persuaded me after some time that they felt what the denomination needed was the kind of leadership, knowledge and experience that has come to me in the various administrative and executive positions which I have held since the "first great appraisal." Thus, with the unanimous support of your Board of Directors, I shall continue to serve in whatever position this Association chooses to use my best efforts.

I believe our democratic and free churches have what a modern world in the flush of scientific success is asking for—an organized expression of the liberal spirit in religion called Unitarianism. Although the roots of our faith are sunk deep into the rich past, we are showing now, as we have shown before, the power and the capacity to speak the language and develop the practices as a religious group which new times and new knowledge demand. Under a united leadership our morale is high. Churches and fellowships seem charged with spiritual energy and have a concern for human needs. Unitarians are continuing to increase their capacity for practical and close co-operation with liberal groups about us. We have caught a vision of sufficient splendor to be driven by a positive fowardmoving religious faith and it is my hope to see its continued development.

THE RESOLUTIONS

Of the eighty-one resolutions submitted the Business Committee has chosen sixteen as most significant and of greatest interest to the parishes. Eight of these may be submitted to the annual meeting of the A.U.A. on May 27. Our parishes are asked to consider these sixteen and to choose by parish referendum, and not later than April 26, the eight which they consider most significant.

Denominational Affairs

#1. A statement of further clarification of the Unitarian position with respect to Christianity. The resolution would be stronger if, in the last paragraph, the word "cherish" were substituted in place of the words "while cherishing" the historic Judeo-Christian, etc. Also, if the phrase "affirm the universal sources and inspiration of modern Unitarian Faith" were omitted. Also, if the word "but" were substituted for the word "and," before the phrase "Express their faith in a Church universal," etc.

#2. Requests the establishment of a new Commission of Appraisal.

#3. Would instruct the Board of Directors to present at least two names for the offices of President and Secretary. And would instruct the Nominating Committee to present at least two names for each vice-presidency and directorship.

#4. Concerns the perennial suggestion to move the headquarters of the American Unitarian Association to some mid-Western city; and to reduce the number of continent-wide meetings.

Problems in Democracy

#5. Deals with Racial Discrimination.

#6. Urges Congress to further protect the rights of individuals and organizations during legislative investigations.

#7. Urges Congress to abolish the un-American Activities Committee.

#8. Urges revision of the U. S. Immigration Policy, so that quotas be immediately based on 1950, rather than on 1920 census of nationality-groups; and so that unused quotas be pooled and allocated to those who most need and deserve a new home.

#9. Urges our State Department to relax restrictions that act as a barrier to freedom to travel.

#10. On Separation of Church and State: calls attention to increasing legislation granting use of Public Funds for Parochial-school Bus-transportation; also to amount of time released for religious-education programs; also to increase pressure for medical care and purchase of text-books from Public Funds, for private School children.

Peace: International Relations, etc.

#11. Deals with United Nations control of Outer Space and testing of Nuclear Weapons; and with pooling of world science Space-exploration under United Nations.

#12. Urges on our Government an immediate and massive expansion of its present cultural-exchange Program, with no restrictions affecting the national or cultural areas with which interchange may be effected.

#13. Recommends to our President and Congress immediate establishment of a new Cabinet post: "Secretary of Peace"; also negotiations aimed at an early call for a Summit Conference.

#14. A reminder of the continual responsibility of working for general disarmament.

#15. Urges our Government to support SUN-FED; also to consider sending surplus goods to under-developed countries through United Nations.

#16. On Population-Control: initiate a study to discover what A.U.A. can do toward solving problem of over-population; and can the Unitarian Service Committee help more by attention to this problem.

OUR NEW PRESIDENT . . .
and what we expect of him

We assume that he will possess that equipment of qualities and virtues which are necessary not only for one in his position, but for any man in almost any position in our varied and busy life: a sound mind in a sound body; the ability to meet and survive the arduous exactions of his office without over-taxing his powers of recuperation.

We assume that he will have a strong and winsome personality to make him liked and trusted by every one he meets; and will give him the power to create and maintain a spirit of harmony, co-operation, mutual dependence and trust in his entire staff of helpers, from the janitor up to his various secretaries of departments and chairmen of special committees.

We assume that he will be an adaptable man: never forget the old Persian proverb, "To him who walks with shoes upon his feet, it is as if the whole earth were clad in leather." Or, if he prefers, the English proverb: "All looks yellow to the jaundiced eye." And remembering either one or both of these bits of wisdom, he will realize that the appraisal of other people is largely determined by himself, and will see to it that his own shoes are fabricated of the material of patience, humor, sympathy and good nature which will assure to him a whole earth clad in friendliness. In moments of weariness and depression it is easy for a speck of jaundice to lodge in the eye. We assume that as a grown man who has

known his share of the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune he is thoroughly aware of this danger and will keep not only his eyes but his spectacles free of all such foreign particles. So much for our assumptions.

We expect that very shortly after his election he will submit himself to be led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil, and will get himself safely by that sordid ordeal as soon as possible, and for good and all.

He will find the same temptations to be dealt with and overcome. First: the temptation to self-interest—my personal success; my fame and popularity and kudos; my private career—here is my chance. Then the temptation to turn the power and influence which his office undeniably invests him withal, into a down-right dictatorship, and make himself an infallible pope whose mandates must be obeyed. The third temptation is the most insidious of all, because it appeals to his better nature. It is the temptation to secure a good result by employing evil methods; to serve God's holy purpose by falling down and worshipping Satan. What we expect of him is a moral constitution already vigorous and sophisticated enough to brush all such temptations aside as easily as though they were so many dirty cobwebs, and start forth into his new duties with a clean heart and a right spirit.

We expect him to cultivate an impregnable impartiality of concern and attention to all the churches in his care. It may be right and proper for Paul to feel pride and gratitude for his Philippians, his Ephesians, and his Thessalonians, contempt and anger for his fickle Galatians, and disgust for his riotous Corinthians, but it is not right and proper for our President. If he must discriminate let his discrimination be directed by the words of Jesus: "They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick. I came to call, not the righteous, but the sinners to repentance."

We demand just one thing. We are determined to be reasonable, and will content ourselves with a single demand: that our President shall never forget the ultimate, over-all, crowning objective of our churches: to quicken, enrich, and dignify the religious life of America, and that in his own personal religious life he shall embody that objective. Countless little sordid situations will arise to divert his attention and make him forget the underlying purpose of it all. Petty politics, log-rolling, wire-pulling, furtive underhand practices, jealousy, suspicion, back-biting, double-crossing—he will probably see plenty of such imps. But we demand that even in this mud and scum of things, he, in his own religious reverence and serenity, shall never lose the power to hear the something that alway, alway sings. We demand that he shall be what he is trying to make us.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Carl Bihldorff is minister of the First Parish in Brookline, Mass. He was educated at Brown University, Rhode Island State College, and Yale Divinity School. Ordained in 1936, he was minister of the First Parish in Duxbury, Mass., and the First Unitarian Church in Louisville, Kentucky.

Edwin C. Broome, Jr., Ph.D., is minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, N. Y. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, Union Theological Seminary, Harvard and Brown Universities, and has served as Dean of the chapel at Colorado State College and the Unitarian Church of Phoenix, Arizona. He has a wide knowledge of the Middle Eastern affairs, having studied and traveled extensively in that area of the world.

The late John Hassler Dietrich was a leading spokesman for Humanism. A graduate of Franklin and Marshall College and the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He left the Reformed Church and entered the Unitarian ministry serving churches in Spokane, Washington, and Minneapolis, Minnesota. He died in 1957.

William Stanley Parker is a member of the First Church in Boston, and clerk of the Board of Trustees. An architect by profession, his first interest is city planning; he has served some twenty-three years on the Boston City Planning Board, and three years on the Massachusetts State Planning Board.

FREE RECORDS

Thanks to one of our members, who prefers to remain anonymous, three hundred 12" LP records containing two recent sermons by Dr. Charles E. Park have been distributed to all Unitarian Fellowship in the United States and Canada. Mr. Munroe Husband, who is in charge of the Fellowships at the American Unitarian Association office, was most co-operative in having them mailed out for us. Many complimentary and deeply appreciative letters acknowledging the receipt of these records have come to us from all sections of the United States and Canada. From these sermons people will learn of the grandeur and tenderness that are in the good news of God, and the compassion and simplicity that are in Christ. These records are available to all who can make good use of them—simply send a card to our treasurer.